Analysis of a sample of Farm Disentone showed that it consisted essentially of kerosene containing tar and creosote.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that statements in the label regarding the efficacy of the drug in the cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease in animals were false and misleading, since the product was not effective for these purposes. The statements represented and suggested: (1) That ailments of poultry and hogs would be practically eliminated ("whipped") by the use of the drug. (2) That the article would be efficacious in preventing germ infection in hogs, cattle, and poultry. (3) That it would be efficacious in the treatment of coughs, colds, and flu in hogs. (4) That it would be efficacious in the treatment of hog scurf, and would cure hog mange. (5) That the use of the drug as directed would enable the user to avoid from 70 to 90 percent of the losses caused by disease in poultry and hogs. And (6), that the drug would be of value in the treatment of ring worms, grub worms, and wire cuts in hogs and cattle.

The article was alleged to be further misbranded in that it was in package form and its label failed to bear any statement of the quantity of contents; and also in that its label failed to bear the common or usual name of each active ingredient.

On October 20, 1942, a plea of guilty having been entered, the court imposed a fine of $25 and half the costs against each defendant.

897. Misbranding of Red-Hed Coxol. U. S. v. Joseph Edward Layton (Production Laboratories). Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, $75. (F. D. C. No. 5512. Sample Nos. 21701–E, 21627–E, 26956–E.)

On March 12, 1942, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington filed an information against Joseph Edward Layton, trading as Production Laboratories, Seattle, Wash., alleging shipment on or about August 7 and November 5, 1940, from the State of Washington into the State of California of quantities of Red-Hed Coxol which was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it consisted essentially of an unsaponifiable oil (mineral oil) 60.8 percent, a saponifiable oil consisting in part of fish oil, turpentine 3 percent, a small amount of iodine, and a red coal-tar dye.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that statements in the labeling which represented and suggested that it would be efficacious as a preventive, treatment, and control for coccidiosis and blackhead in poultry were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes.

On October 27, 1942, the defendant having entered a plea of nolo contendere, the court imposed a fine of $75.

898. Misbranding of Mineralized Molactas Block, Turk-A-Tox, Mineral Block, Murco Antiseptic Tablets, and Mineralized Molactas Block – Hog Bricks with Nicotinic Acid. U. S. v. Lapp Laboratories, Inc. Plea of guilty. Fine, $125. (F. D. C. No. 5562. Sample Nos. 16166–E, 39119–E, 39121–E to 39123–E, incl., 39125–E.)

On May 4, 1942, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Iowa filed an information against Lapp Laboratories, Inc., Nevada, Iowa, alleging shipment from on or about April 8 to September 17, 1940, from the State of Iowa into the State of Missouri of quantities of the above-named products that were misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of Mineralized Molactas Block showed that the product consisted essentially of mineral salts, carbohydrates, small proportions of nitrogenous matter, and charcoal. It contained not more than 5.5 percent of crude protein, not more than 37 percent of nitrogen-free extract, 8.6 percent of calcium compounds calculated as calcium, 0.5 percent of phosphorus, and 6.8 percent of salt. Based on this analysis it was alleged that the following statement in a circular accompanying the product was false and misleading: "Nitrogen Free Extract, not less than 63.0% * * * Potassium Iodide * * * Copper Sulphate * * * Calcium * * * 4.2% * * * Iodine * * * .04%, Salt * * * not more than 2.5%." It was alleged to be further misbranded in that the statements appearing on the circular regarding its efficacy in the cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease in animals were false and misleading, since it would not be efficacious for such purposes. These representations and suggestions were, in part, as follows: For keeping all livestock healthy, for wormy hogs, as a preventive or control of intestinal parasites of hogs, as a preventive of bloating of livestock, as an aid in the control of intestinal worms, as a source of elements healing and soothing to the bruised intestine, and as efficacious in case of necrotic enteritis due to nutritional deficiencies.